

Flaws In The Big Bang Point To **GENESIS**, A
New Millennium Model Of The Cosmos: Part 10 —
The Absence Of Pop III Stars And Prior Discovery
Of Short Half-Life Extinct Primordial Radioactivity
Disprove Big Bang's Nucleosynthesis Scenario And
Substantiates GENESIS' Rapid Creation Postulate

Robert V. Gentry
The Orion Foundation
P. O. Box 12067
Knoxville, TN 37912
gentryrv@orionfdn.org

28 February 2001

Abstract

Big-bang cosmology predicts an abundance of first generation, Population III stars should have formed after the initial nucleogenesis singularity. In theory these stars were composed mainly of H and He, with only a trace of heavier elements. Decades of astronomical searches have failed to locate any that can be definitely identified with these characteristics, thus refuting big bang's prediction for the origin of the universe's two dominant chemical elements. Disproof of big bang's nucleosynthesis scenario for the origin of all chemical elements comes from the heretofore rarely acknowledged discovery of primordial short half-life extinct natural radioactivity in Earth's primordial rocks. This discovery shows (i) the chemical elements of which the earth is composed did not originate in supernova nucleosynthetic reactions and (ii) the primordial earth formed very rapidly rather than being the product of slow evolutionary change over geological time. These results, plus the failure of big bang's spacetime expansion hypothesis, point to the need of a new model of the cosmos.

Previous papers in this series have detailed several lines of experimental evidence which contradict big bang's fundamental spacetime expansion

and Cosmological Principle postulates and which moreover show that the expansion hypothesis has always involved huge nonconservation-of-energy losses. We now turn attention to another cornerstone of big-bang cosmology: namely, its apparently successful prediction of light element abundances. Here we discuss two observations, one astrophysical and the other nuclear geophysical, both of which contradict big bang's prediction of H and He primordial nucleogenesis as well as its supernova nucleosynthesis scenario for the origin of heavier chemical elements. The astrophysical observation is treated first.

1 The Absence Of Population III Stars Contradicts Big Bang's Light Element Nucleosynthesis Postulate

An unequivocal consequence of big bang's primordial, light-element nucleosynthesis postulate is that the first generation stars — also known as Population III stars — were composed almost solely of H and He, without the heavier elements that big-bang theory claims originated in much later supernovae events. The problem is that after many decades of careful searching, no star has yet been definitely identified as being a Pop III star [1,2]. If the big-bang scenario were correct, then vast numbers of Pop III stars should have been identified long ago. Clearly, the failure to find them effectively contradicts an unequivocal prediction of its primordial nucleosynthesis postulate.

Moreover, the absence of Pop III stars also raises an important question about the origin of relatively metal-rich Population I stars and metal-poor Population II stars. Conventional wisdom assumes the heavy element content of these stars originated in Pop III supernovae nucleosynthesis, and hence Pop I and Pop II stars must have somehow formed from the accumulated debris of many such events. But if the expected vast number of Pop III stars do not exist, it is obvious that conventional wisdom about the origin of Pop I and Pop II stars must be wrong.

In particular, while it is certainly true that higher-Z elements are synthesized in supernovae, what has been completely overlooked are the results which show it is impossible that debris from such events could, on the basis of big-bang theory, ever reaccumulate to form a single star with significant amounts of these chemical elements. Specifically, Part 3 of this series has already dealt with this topic at some length. There it was shown that if expansion had worked to produce the present separation of galaxies, it should have also worked to produce expansion within galaxies and, moreover, to have worked in particular against accumulation and condensation of

gaseous clouds to form stars. Thus, realistically speaking, it is impossible to accept the idea that what are classified as Pop I or Pop II stars ever formed according to conventional theory. We now turn attention to the nuclear geophysical results which confirm this fact.

2 The Occurrence Of Fossil Evidence Of Short Half-Life Extinct Natural Radioactivity Disproves Big Bang's Nucleosynthesis Scenario

By way of introduction to this topic, reference is made to Silk's discussion [3] of certain isotopic anomalies in meteorites, anomalies which are interpreted as presenting constraints on the elapsed time from supernovae nucleosynthesis to the formation of the meteorites which contain them. The anomalies are found in small embedded regions, or inclusions, where the composition differs significantly from the surrounding meteoritic material. The ratios of certain isotopes in the inclusions differ markedly from terrestrial ratios. A key result has been the discovery of trace amounts of a rare isotope of magnesium, ^{26}Mg , in aluminum-rich inclusions. While this isotope does not occur naturally, it is found that the greater the aluminum enrichment, the more ^{26}Mg is found in these meteoritic inclusions. This isotope is the decay product of ^{26}Al , which has a half-life of about a million years.

Conventional wisdom is that ^{26}Al was produced in a nearby supernova event according to the big bang's hypothesis of the origin of the heavier elements and that it was then incorporated into the meteorite before decaying away. Thus it has been concluded that ^{26}Al fits the definition of what is known as *extinct natural radioactivity*, which is any type of radioactivity that formed during nucleosynthesis with a half-life long enough to span the interval from nucleosynthesis to either the formation of meteorites or Earth's primeval rocks. The finding of fossil evidence of ^{26}Mg decay doesn't challenge big bang's nucleosynthesis scenario because conventional wisdom is that meteorites could somehow have formed soon enough after nucleosynthesis to incorporate the million-year half-life ^{26}Al prior to its decay.

On the other hand, if fossil evidence of very much shorter half-life extinct natural radioactivity were discovered in meteorites or Earth's primeval rocks, such discovery very definitely would contradict both big bang's H and He nucleogenesis scenario as well as its heavy element nucleosynthesis scenario and in essence falsify the entire theory.

Quite surprisingly, although it has thus far received little attention, the discovery of this type of fossil radioactivity in Earth's primeval rocks has

been repeatedly published in well-known scientific journals for over three decades without being refuted in the established literature [4,5]. The half-lives of the extinct natural radionuclides reported [4,5] are indeed impossible to reconcile with big bang's prediction that the Earth formed by slow cooling over geological time. They show instead that it must have formed rapidly rather than developing by slow cooling over eons of geological time. Until now most astrophysicists and cosmologists have apparently been generally unaware of these results, the full implications of which will be documented in Part 12 of this series. Also documented is the resistance to the dissemination of this discovery by various scientists and editors of well-known scientific journals.

The discovery of relics of primordial short half-life radioactivity in Earth's primeval rocks overturns all of big bang's nucleosynthesis scenario, just as disproof of the expansion hypothesis overturns both the conventional interpretation of many astrophysical phenomena, as well as long-held cosmological dogma concerning the origin, age, and development of the cosmos.

3 How Disproof Of Big Bang Nucleosynthesis and Spacetime Expansion Overturns All Current Views Of The History Of The Cosmos

- Without spacetime expansion the Hubble relation shows the universe does possess a Center which is near the Galaxy.
- Without spacetime expansion there was no big bang.
- Without the big bang, the beginning of time cannot be traced back to a spacetime expansion singularity.
- Without the big bang there is no basis for tracing the history of any star back to its beginning.
- Without the big bang there was no primordial nucleosynthesis of any chemical elements, hence no 'first generation' H/He stars, and no possibility of producing any other stars by 'first generation star' supernovae nucleosynthesis.
- Disproof of big bang's nucleosynthesis scenario shows that the heavy chemical element content of the visible universe did not originate in a series of distant supernovae events but instead had a different origin.

- Disproof of big bang's time frame disqualifies all current astrophysical theories about the origin and age of stars as well as the origin and age of galaxies.
- Disproof of big bang's time frame renders invalid all current astrophysical interpretations which picture various star types evolving from one type to another.
- Disproof of big bang renders invalid all astrophysical theories that attempt to picture different types of galaxies evolving from one type to another. This implies the array of peculiar galaxies observed by Arp [6-8] should long ago have been recognized as proof that all current theories of galaxy formation are fatally flawed.
- Disproof of big bang completely erases the scientific basis for tracing Earth's origin back to a primordial molten blob that spun off the sun.
- Proof of fossil relics of short half-life primordial natural radioactivity in Earth's primordial rocks proves the Earth was the product of a rapid creation event.

4 Transition To A Radically New View Of The Cosmos

In 1992 worldwide media attention focused on the COBE results as apparent proof that the 2.7K CBR should be identified with highly redshifted relic radiation from big bang's fireball at time of decoupling [9(a)]. In his 1994 book Smoot recounts his first press conference about the COBE results, an occasion which he began by stating [9(b)]:

"We had observed the oldest and largest structures ever seen in the early universe. These were the primordial seeds of modern-day structures such as galaxies, clusters of galaxies, and so on. Not only that, but they represented huge ripples in the fabric of space-time left from the creation period."

Upon being pressed by the media to give more insight into the ultimate meaning of his team's discovery, Smoot further recounts that the one comparison that caught more media attention than any other was [9(b)], *"If you're religious, it's like seeing God."* He then reflects that, *"The big bang is a cultural icon, a scientific explanation of the creation,"* and that through his discovery, *"Our faith in the big bang is revitalized ..."*. The wrinkles in

the CBR are still there, but this series of papers has shown that faith in the big bang was misplaced. Trefil has noted that in times past a certain astronomical assumption gained such a degree of credibility that it was considered beyond question until an accumulation of new data forced the unthinkable [10]. That time has now come for the big bang. We can no longer look back to the distant past where, for no reason, something sprang from nothing to eventually produce the order of the cosmos. Modern cosmology's dominant theory is fatally flawed; it logically follows there must exist a new paradigm, or model, based on better principles. And because those principles are so different from the those of the big bang, it is clear that the new paradigm, or model, will be radically different to the point of representing a quantum shift in our perception of the universe.

5 Anticipation Of A Quantum Paradigm Shift

The 1930s saw a paradigm shift away from the unchanging universe of Herschel and other early astronomers to the Friedmann-Lemaitre expanding spacetime paradigm. In 1990 Ellis reviewed this shift, and then, as the following quote shows, got into the question of whether the shift to the expanding spacetime paradigm was the last to be expected [11], which was followed by a brief exchange with Hoyle:

“... Today's dominant view is not necessarily correct, and indeed there almost certainly is some new view waiting to be recognized; the precursors of that new view are probably already with us. On the other hand just because a new paradigm arises does not mean it is correct! The major message is that working scientists need to be aware of the pressures to conform, and the strength of the 'bandwagon' effect. There is a constant need to question and test the currently accepted foundations of cosmology and cosmological models.” [Ellis, ref.11, p.108]

Discussion

Hoyle:

“A question and a comment. The comment is that you have shown how strong conformist pressures can be, interestingly enough even when the greatest scientists are involved. What happens is that observations gradually pile up against populist views. Then there is a kind of quantum transition to a new view — usually

the view that accommodates the new observations with the minimum of change in theory. My question now: do you think the last quantum transition has now happened? If not then there are interesting implications!” [ref. 11, p.112]

Ellis:

Almost certainly we have not seen the last such transition. [ref. 11, p.112]

6 The Transition To A New Model Of The Cosmos — “It is almost irresistible for humans to believe that we have some special relation to the universe ... ”

Clearly, even though Ellis is open to the possibility of a transition to a new paradigm, he also cautions that just because one arises does not mean it is correct. The first hurdle that it must pass is of course the experimental verification of its fundamental postulates. Parts 7-9 have dealt with the verification of GENESIS’ cosmic postulates, and this paper and the next two deal with the topic of its geologic and biological postulates. It now seems rather obvious that several fundamental errors were unwittingly made in attempting to formulate the correct foundational postulates for the origin and history of the cosmos. Just as obviously, our understanding of the cosmos will not make sense until we discover the correct postulates. One of the outstanding differences in the big bang and GENESIS is that the former denied that the action of God was needed to bring the cosmos to its present state. The disproof of big-bang cosmology effectively disproves that approach in answering the question of cosmic origins. The results of this series of papers suggest a transition in our perception of the cosmos may have already begun here at the beginning of the new millennium. Even though it is only now emerging, it seems the seeds of this transition were sown decades ago.

For example, it is now apparent that in 1977 Weinberg pinpointed modern cosmology’s dilemma when he remarked [12], “*It is almost irresistible for humans to believe that we have some special relation to the universe, that human life is not just a more-or-less farcical outcome of a chain of accidents reaching back to the first three minutes, but that we were somehow built in from the beginning.*” Then, after reflecting that the vastness and beauty of the Wyoming landscape he was observing from his airplane seat at 33,000

feet was “... *just a tiny part of an overwhelmingly hostile universe,*” he continues this theme, saying, “... *It is even harder to realize that this present universe has evolved from an unspeakably unfamiliar early condition, and faces a future extinction of endless cold or intolerable heat.*”

In contrasting the attraction of a purposeful existence with the unspeakable bleakness of big bang’s finality, Weinberg implicitly focuses attention on an issue of truly epic proportions when he refers to humanity’s innate tendency to believe we have some special relation to the universe, that we were “*somehow built in from the beginning.*” This is, of course, something that modern cosmology has long denied. In essence Weinberg has identified the key that unlocks the mystery of how and why modern cosmology went awry in selecting its cornerstone postulates.

Copernicus revolutionized astronomy when he discovered the Earth revolved around the sun. But neither he nor Galileo, who suffered persecution from the Church for upholding Copernicus’ discovery, disproved the existence of a nearby universal Center. Nevertheless the reaction to these events spawned the perception that science, not GENESIS, was the new truth. And, as presumed arbiters of ultimate truth, modern cosmologists became masters of their own destiny. They wrote their own ticket for the origin and development of a cosmos that excluded biblical GENESIS and a universal Center, and in so doing erected an almost impenetrable anti-science, psychological barrier against the astronomical proofs that humans do occupy a very special place in the cosmos. So great has been the power of this bandwagon effect that Ellis spoke of [11] that only now, after many decades, has it finally been surmounted.

Without due cause, modern cosmology *a priori* rejected the Creator’s claim of exercising *supranatural power in calling the visible universe — with all its mature and exotic diversities — into existence on literal Day 4 of the Genesis creation week.*

7 The Emergence and Purpose of Biblical GENESIS

Weinberg’s perception that humans have an almost irresistible tendency to believe they have some special relation to the universe, somehow built in from the beginning [12], is echoed in Disney’s recent critique of modern cosmology [13]: “... *we would all love to know the fate of the universe, just as we’d love to know if God exists.*” Surely a God who created the universe as biblical GENESIS describes likewise intends for this to be understood by all intelligent beings capable of rational thinking. But for this to occur it follows that the Creator must have placed unambiguous signatures of His

creatorship throughout the cosmos, signatures that can be recognized by comparing GENESIS' specifications and postulates with observations.

The earlier papers in this series have shown why the New Redshift Interpretation has been adopted as GENESIS' astrophysical framework. And among the properties of this framework that serve to distinguish it from the big bang, none is more definitive, or more easily understood, than the smoking gun signatures in Parts 7 and 9 which prove that the universe does possess a Center near the Galaxy, and that the 2.7K CBR does function as an absolute reference frame for the universe [14]. Indeed, a key element in developing this new model of the cosmos holds to the premise that the Galaxy's nearness to the Center of the universe is not a cosmic accident, but instead suggests that Earth itself may hold the key from which not only its own origin and history can be deciphered, but also that of the vast cosmos of which the Earth is an integral part. Biblical GENESIS confirms the primacy of Earth's creation in that the record states it occurred on literal Day 1 of creation week whereas the rest of the visible universe, with all its vast, exotic diversity, was subsequently called into existence on literal Day 4 [15].

Reference has already been made to the discovery in Earth's primeval rocks of fossil evidence of radionuclides which have very short half-lives. These radionuclides have been identified with primordial radioactivity, with the implication that the primordial Earth formed very rapidly [4-5], consistent with it being called into existence as per the GENESIS records [15]. Deciphering the implications of this radioactivity relative to Earth's origin and history is a scientific endeavor that has long been in progress [4-5].

Previously, however, it was not clear just how these results could be reconciled with the conventional view of the origin and history of the cosmos because of their conflict with big bang's prediction of an Earth that formed by eons-long slow cooling. The demise of big bang cosmology, and discovery of the NRI's ability to act as GENESIS' astrophysical framework for the universe has changed all that. In Part 12 we show how the discovery of traces of short half-life primordial radioactivity [4,5] and the emergence of GENESIS combine to form a firm, unified scientific foundation for a significant shift in our perception of the cosmos. In Part 11 we first reexamine the foundations of modern biology and geology [16].

References

- [1] R. Cayrel, *Astron Astrophys. Rev.* **7**, 217 (1996).
- [2] Timothy C. Beers, arXiv:astro-ph/9911171.

- [3] Joseph Silk, *The Big Bang* (W. H. Freeman & Co., 1991) pp. 337-339.
- [4] (a) R. V. Gentry, *Nature* **213**, 487 (1967); (b) *Science* **160**, 1228 (1968); (c) *Science* **173**, 727 (1971); (d) *Ann. Rev. Nuc. Science*, **23**, 347 (1973); (e) *Science* **184**, 62 (1974); (f) *Nature* **258**, 269 (1975); (g) “Are Any Unusual Radiohalos Evidence of Superheavy Elements?” pages 123-154 in *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Superheavy Elements, Lubbock, Texas, March 9-11, 1978*, Pergamon Press, New York; (h) *Nature* **274**, 457 (1978); *EOS Trans. of AGU* **60**, 474 (1979); (i) *EOS Trans. of AGU* **61**, 514 (1980); (j) *Radiohalos in a Radiochronological and Cosmological Perspective*, in *Evolutionists Confront Creationists, Proceedings of 63rd Ann. Meeting of the Pacific Division, AAAS* **1**, 38 (1984); *Creation’s Tiny Mystery* (Earth Science Associates, Knoxville, TN 37912, 1992); *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal*, Vol. 12 (No 3) 287 (1998).
- [5] (a) R. V. Gentry at al., *Nature* **244**, 283 (1973); (b) *Nature* **252**, 564 (1974); (c) *Science* **294**, 315 (1976); (d) *Science* **216**, 296 (1982); (e) *Geophys. Res. Letters* **9**, 1129 (1982).
- [6] H. Arp, *Atlas of Peculiar Galaxies* (California Institute of Technology, 1966).
- [7] H. Arp and B. Madore, *A Catalogue of Southern Peculiar Galaxies and Associations*, Vols. 1&2 (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1987).
- [8] H. Arp, *Seeing Red: Redshifts, Cosmology, and Academic Science* (Aperion, Montreal, 1998).
- [9] (a) George Smoot et al., *Ap. J* **396**, L1 (1992); (b) George Smoot and Keay Davidson, *Wrinkles in Time* (AVON BOOKS, A division of The Hearst Corporation, 1994) pp. 288-289.
- [10] James Trefil, *The Dark Side of the Universe* (Anchor Books, New York, 1988) pp.12-13.
- [11] G. F. R. Ellis, *Innovation, resistance and change: the transition to the expanding universe*, in *Modern Cosmology In Retrospect* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990), pp. 97-113.
- [12] Steven Weinberg, *The First Three Minutes* (Bantam Books 1977), pp.143-144.

- [13] M. Disney, arXiv:astro-ph/0009020.
- [14] V. F. Weisskopf, *American Scientist*, **71**, No. 5, 473 (1983).
- [15] Genesis 1, Psalm 33:6,9, and Exodus 20:11 describe how God called the *visible universe*, with all its exotic and mature diversities, into existence on the literal Day 4 of creation week. Genesis 1 also describes the Earth being called into existence on literal Day 1. In contrast, we also consider that Psalm 68:33 (RSV) — “Sing to God, O kingdoms of the earth; sing praises to the Lord, Selah to him who rides in the heavens, *the ancient heavens*; lo, he sends forth his voice, his mighty voice.” — describes the *invisible ancient heavens*. In the biblical framework described herein these *invisible ancient heavens* are identified with the outer galactic shell, and were the object of a separate, much earlier creation event.
- [16] Many thanks to Dave Gentry for very useful discussions.